

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. NVDA/P000723

**REMARKS**

This RCE is intended as a full and complete response to the Final Office Action dated July 22, 2005 having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on October 22, 2005 and the Advisory Action dated September 13, 2005. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-14 and 17-21 remain pending in the application after entry of this response. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended and new claims 19-21 have been added. No new matter has been added by either the amendments or new claims.

Claims 1, 3-7, 9, 11-14, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Inoue (U.S. Pat. No. 6,311,767). Claim 2 is rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue in view of Bartley (U.S. Pat. No. 6,084,775). Claims 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue. Reconsideration of the claims is requested for reasons presented below.

***Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102***

Claims 1, 3-7, 9, 11-14, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Inoue. Inoue does not teach, suggest, or disclose a heat sink assembly "configured to be disposed onto the processor," a heat sink lid ... configured to leave a substantial portion of the air channel uncovered," or a heat sink assembly, wherein "the length of the at least a portion of the bottom surface [defining the air channel] is equal to or greater than the length of the processor" as recited in claim 1. Further, Inoue does not teach, suggest, or disclose a "heat sink lid configured ... such that a substantial portion of an air channel in the heat sink assembly is left uncovered," as recited in claim 11.

Inoue discloses a computer fan assembly 10 configured to satisfy the confined space requirements of and to provide adequate cooling capacity for a laptop CPU 78. The Examiner cites Fig. 1 as showing heat sink lid 24 (24 is actually the entire upper body portion, 36 is specifically the lid which is part of 24) as leaving a portion of channels 58 uncovered. Fig. 4 illustrates that the lid 36 covers a substantial portion of the channels 58. Further, Inoue's basic teaching is to use an oil filled heat pipe 20 to

Page 5

402789\_1

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. NVDA/P000723

transfer heat from laptop CPU 78 to system 10. In doing so, system 10 is able to satisfy the stringent height requirement H (see Fig. 7) of the laptop computer 72 (as opposed to installing system 10 onto the laptop CPU 78). In doing so, Inoue's channels 58 only need to be long enough to cool the heat pipe 20 which is most likely only a few millimeters (mm) in diameter (see Fig. 7, H is less than 12 mm (col. 4, line 13)).

For these reasons, Applicant submits that Inoue does not teach each and every limitation of claims 1 and 11 and, therefore, these claims are patentable over Inoue. Further, since claims 2, 4-10, and 17-21 depend from allowable claim 1, and 13 and 14 depend from allowable claim 11, these claims also are patentable over Inoue.

Regarding claim 19 on its own merit, Figs. 6 and 7 illustrate the assembly 10 installed in a laptop computer 72 adjacent to and partially within an opening 76 in the enclosure 74 of the laptop computer 72. Fig. 7 illustrates that the enclosure 74 substantially covers the portion of the channels 58 left uncovered by lid 36.

### ***Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103***

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue in view of Bartley. Bartley discloses nothing more than a heat sink 41 having a low melting point release layer 47. Thus, Bartley fails to cure the deficiencies of Inoue set forth above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over Inoue in view of Bartley. Claim 2 is also patentable over Inoue in view of Bartley since it depends from claim 1.

Claims 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue. As discussed above, amended claim 1 is patentable over Inoue and claims 8 and 10 are also patentable over Inoue since they depend from claim 1.

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. NVDA/P000723

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the invention as now claimed. Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Kenyon Ripple  
Registration No. 55,769  
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.  
595 Shrewsbury Ave. Suite 100  
Shrewsbury, NJ 07702  
Telephone: (650) 330-2310  
Facsimile: (650) 330-2314  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Page 7

402789\_1